

Dear Debra and Tom,

10/18/96

My wife with her new typewriter did not do as well as I'd hoped in asking her to improve on my poor typing of which you are aware. Sorry. But it is more legible than what I did. (25172 Calle Pradera, Lake Forest)

I hope I have Debra's correct address. I cannot find that file. I long ago ran out of filing space in my ~~box~~ office and cannot use the stairs to the cellar. If it is not the correct address I hope you will send her a copy.

I made a hasty search of what is accessible to me to bear on what I alleged in what I've written. Rather than his original request for it I enclose Evica's own version, that I am a disinformation agent. That in his mind is because he says I have written and spoken critically of others. What he does not say is whether I started that or whether ~~in a minority of instances~~ I was responding to what they had said of me.

Inherent in this stupidity of his is his belief that error must not be corrected. If any assassination nut utters any insanity that must be accepted by all others with complete silence.

The fact is that I have avoided all that I could. I do not want to waste what time remains to me in that. He gives no specifics and I have no idea what he has in mind but it is a fact that for years I avoided all that I could and since then have had little to say in response to what nuts have attributed to me.

As an example of what I have in mind in referring to Evica as a subject-matter ignoramus, which despite all his boasting he is, I enclose what was sent me about that sick meeting at Providence. He is quoted as saying "We're going to find that the groups that brought Kennedy to Dallas and had him killed ~~xxxx~~ had similar motivations." In this he says that JFK assassinated himself, such is his ignorance of realities rather than assassination nuttiness. It was JFK himself who insisted on that trip to Dallas, over so many objections, strong objections. There was no group of "groups" that ~~xx~~ brought him there. As is very well known except to your editor who sits in judgement on all others from the depths of his subject-matter ignorance.

It is I think well past time for there to be some thought to all the misinformation and disinformation about the assassination that deceives and misleads most people. Just because some self-important fool says something does not make it so and much of what gets to the people is from those self-important fools.

You can see what Evica attributed to me in seeking a paper on me as serving the government's interest. What you do not see and will not see is anything from him in which he alleges that I was factually incorrect in whatever it is that he had in mind. This, of course, is also a challenge for that big-mouthed, self-

important, subject-matter ignoramus to come up with example of what if anything he had in mind.

If anything.

The nuttiness represented by this account of that Providence session is what has done as much as anything to give all criticism a bad name.

In any event, this should indicate to you why I do not want any changes made in what I wrote that I do not approve of. I do not want my name connected with any such stupid and unfactual stuff.

May I suggest that if you want some lively copy for a future issue you get your editor to put down what he attributes to me that he believes is wrong and I'll address that.

My belief is that, given his own knowledge of his assassination ~~knowledge~~, this will not interest him.

I look forward to your assurance that what I submitted will not be published without my approving ~~to~~ any changes in it.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

Please note that despite the infamous nature of what Evica sought to do to me and to my reputation I have been silent about it other than to him and to Rose. But look at the utter irrationality of what Evica said after two revisions of his letter in the 15 days before he mailed it: Even if whatever he says I said ~~is~~ true I am a "public liability," the words he used. And a government "disinformation agent." He lied at Providence, lied from ignorance. If I or anyone else correct his lie we are a "public liability" and a "disinformation agent." Not him, not the liar, not the loud-mouthed ignoramus. And I am confident that he cannot attribute any factual error to me. Not that he knows enough about the fact as distinguished from the nuttiness to try. You'll be lucky if he does not get you in trouble with what this reflects.